

**Filozofická fakulta
Univerzity Karlovy v Praze**

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky



Konkurence konjunktivu, konstrukce se „should“ a indikativu v závislých
větách rozkazovacích

The subjunctive versus the *should*-construction and the indicative in
dependent imperative clauses

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Barbora Vlčková

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Markéta Malá, Ph.D.

Srpen 2011

Děkuji vedoucí své bakalářské práce, PhDr. Markétě Malé, Ph.D., za čas,
který mi věnovala, její ochotu, laskavost a cenné rady.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a že jsem uvedla všechny použité prameny a literaturu.

V Praze dne 17. 8. 2011

I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned.

Abstract

English dependent imperative clauses allow three possible forms of the verb phrase in the predicate: the subjunctive, the *should*-construction and the indicative. The present study deals with these paradigmatic variants and aims to examine their distribution in British English in a synchronic as well as a diachronic perspective.

Drawing on grammars and previous studies, the theoretical part of the thesis provides an overview of the present issue and describes important terms. It is to serve mainly as background for the research part, which follows. The research project consists of two parts: a diachronic and a synchronic one. While the diachronic part focuses on the development of the distribution of the variants in dependent imperative clauses from the second half of the 20th century to the present, the synchronic part attempts to define some factors which may influence the use of these variants in contemporary English.

The study uses various corpora of British English as primary material for the research. Excerpted examples were analyzed and results were produced, on the basis of which conclusions were drawn.

V anglické závislé rozkazovací větě se pro realizaci přísudku nabízejí tři různé formy: konjunktiv, konstrukce se „*should*” a indikativ. Bakalářská práce se zabývá těmito paradigmatickými variantami a klade si za cíl prozkoumat jejich distribuci v britské angličtině, jak ze synchronního, tak diachronního hlediska.

Teoretická část práce, která má sloužit hlavně jako podklad pro výzkumnou část, čerpá z gramatik a předchozích studií. Poskytuje přehled dané problematiky a osvětluje důležité termíny. Následující sekce popisuje výzkumný projekt, který se skládá ze dvou částí: diachronní a synchronní. Zatímco diachronní část se zaměřuje na vývoj distribuce variant v závislých rozkazovacích větách od druhé poloviny 20. století do současnosti, synchronní část se snaží definovat faktory, které by mohly ovlivňovat užívání těchto variant v moderní angličtině.

Jako hlavní zdroj výzkumného projektu používá bakalářská práce několik korpusů britské angličtiny. Z nich excerpané příklady byly podrobněji analyzovány, aby mohly být vyjádřeny výsledky, které následně vedly k vyvození konečného závěru.

Contents

List of abbreviations	6
List of tables.....	7
1. Introduction.....	8
2. Theoretical background	9
2.1. Dependent imperative clause	9
2.1.1. Semantic criteria for dependent imperative clauses	10
2.2. Mandative construction.....	12
2.2.1. Ambiguity between mandative and non-mandative	14
2.3. Mandative subjunctive	15
2.4. Putative <i>should</i>	16
2.5. Indicative.....	17
2.6. Mandative subjunctive versus putative <i>should</i> and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses	18
2.6.1. Distribution according to register.....	18
2.6.2. Distribution according to dialect	18
3. Research project.....	20
3.1. Objectives and hypotheses	20
3.1.1. Diachronic research	20
3.1.2. Synchronic research.....	20
3.2. Material	22
3.3. Methods.....	22
3.3.1. Method used in the diachronic research	22
3.3.2. Method used in the synchronic research	23
3.4. Research data	25
3.4.1. Presentation and discussion of the diachronic research data.....	25
3.4.3. Presentation and discussion of the synchronic research data	29
3.4.3.1. Overall distribution.....	29
3.4.3.2. Distribution with respect to the structure of the subject of the dependent clause	32

3.4.3.3. Distribution with respect to the verb in the dependent clause	34
3.4.3.4. Distribution with respect to the form of the verb in the main clause.....	35
3.4.3.5. Distribution with respect to genre category	37
4. Conclusion	39
References.....	41
Sources and tools	42
Summary (Shrnutí v češtině)	43
Appendices (on a separate CD)	47

List of abbreviations

Abbreviations used in text

AmE	American English
BrE	British English
LOB	Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus
FLOB	Freiburg-LOB Corpus
BE06	British English 2006 Corpus
BNC	British National Corpus

Abbreviations used in tables

NPS	simple noun phrase
NPC	complex noun phrase
NPCP	complex noun phrase with postmodification
NPCC	complex coordinated noun phrase

List of tables

Table 1: Suggest or suggestion	25
Table 2: Recommend or recommendation	25
Table 3: Demand (verb and noun)	25
Table 4: Important	25
Table 5: Ask	26
Table 6: Essential	26
Table 7: Insist, insistence or insistent	26
Table 8: Necessary	26
Table 9: Propose	26
Table 10: Request (verb and noun)	27
Table 11: Require or requirement	27
Table 12: Urge	27
Table 13: Suggest, recommend, demand, require (overall distribution)	29
Table 14: Suggest (subject)	32
Table 15: Recommend (subject)	32
Table 16: Demand (subject)	32
Table 17: Require (subject)	32
Table 18: Suggest (verb in the dependent clause)	34
Table 19: Recommend (verb in the dependent clause)	34
Table 20: Demand (verb in the dependent clause)	34
Table 21: Require (verb in the dependent clause)	34
Table 22: Suggest (verb in the main clause)	35
Table 23: Recommend (verb in the main clause)	35
Table 24: Demand (verb in the main clause)	36
Table 25: Require (verb in the main clause)	36
Table 26: Suggest (genre)	37
Table 27: Recommend (genre)	37
Table 28: Demand (genre)	37
Table 29: Require (genre)	37

1. Introduction

The present thesis deals with English dependent imperative clauses, introduced by verbs (or possibly nouns and adjectives) expressing a suggestion or demand. In the dependent imperative clause, three different forms of the verb phrase are found in variation: the subjunctive, the construction with *should*, and the indicative, e.g. *I demand that he go/ should go/ goes with us*. The first of the variants, the subjunctive, has been generally considered a specific feature of American English (AmE), occurring rarely in British English (BrE), which is supposed to prefer the *should*-construction or the indicative; however, grammars and recent studies indicate that the use of the subjunctive has been increasing significantly in the dialect of BrE, most probably due to the influence of AmE. The indicative as one of the variants in the dependent imperative clause is, on the other hand, considered to be acceptable exclusively in BrE.

The study aims to investigate the distribution of the subjunctive, the *should*-construction and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses, focusing on the regional variety of BrE. Using four different BrE corpora, it attempts to examine the development of the use of the individual variants in the respective dialect from the 1960s to the first decade of the 21st century, and to trace some factors which may influence the choice of a particular form of the verb phrase in the dependent imperative clause in contemporary BrE.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Dependent imperative clause

As there are various classifications of subordinate clauses in English offered by different grammars, it is important to explain what is meant by the concept of the dependent imperative clause in the present thesis. Dušková et al. describe the dependent imperative clause as a type of content clause, generally occurring in the form of the infinitive (*She entreated him to be patient*), and with certain verbs also expressed by a finite clause with the *should*-construction (*I suggest that we should consult a lawyer.*) or the subjunctive (*I demand that my complaint be dealt with at once*). (Dušková et al., 2006: 606) The content clause is defined by Dušková et al. as a subordinate clause which conveys the content of what is implied in the matrix clause. The type of the dependent content clause (i.e., declarative, interrogative, exclamative, optative or imperative), as well as its form, are then governed by the superordinate expression in the matrix clause. (*ibid.*: 594)

This definition bears a similarity to what Biber et al. present as the complement clause: “Complement clauses are a type of dependent clause used to complete the meaning relationship of an associated verb or adjective in a higher clause.” (Biber et al., 2000: 660) However, Biber et al. do not distinguish the dependent imperative clause as a subtype of a complement clause; rather, a distinction is made among subtypes of complement clauses on the basis of their structure.¹ *That*-clauses, one of the types of complement clauses, are characterized as commonly used for the reported speech, thought, attitudes, etc., although some semantically specific verbs, such as *ask*, *order*, *advise* and *insist*, can be used with a *that*-clause also “to propose a potential course of action rather than report information.” (*We ask that this food be blessed.*) (*ibid.*: 9.2.2.2.) This use of *that*-clauses typically appears with the *should*-construction or the subjunctive (*ibid.*: 9.2.2.2.) and corresponds with the notion of the dependent imperative clause presented by Dušková et al.

The term ‘*that*-clause’ is also used by Quirk et al., who classify it as a category of nominal clauses, that is, clauses which resemble noun phrases in function; *that*-clauses are also referred to as subordinate declarative clauses. (Quirk et al., 1985: 1048) Quirk et al. further distinguish semantic classes of superordinate verbs, adjectives and nouns which

¹ “There are four major structural types of complement clauses: *that*-clauses, *wh*-clauses, *to*-infinitive clauses and *ing*-clauses.” (Biber et al., 2000: 660)

determine the form of the verb phrase in the dependent *that*-clause; we are especially concerned with *suasive* words, as these can be followed by the *should*-construction, the subjunctive or the indicative in a *that*-clause (*ibid.*: 1181). The clauses dependent on the *suasive* expressions thus correspond to what Dušková et al. refer to as dependent imperative clauses.

Some grammarians argue that there are in fact no subordinate imperative clauses. Although Huddleston and Pullum recognize content clauses similarly to Dušková et al., they state: “Imperatives normally occur as main clauses: there is no grammatically distinct construction that can properly be regarded as the subordinate counterpart of a main clause imperative [...] Imperatives are generally used as directives and directives can of course be reported. But they are reported by means of constructions where the subordinate clauses are syntactically and semantically very different from imperative clauses.” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 943) In the present thesis we shall adhere to the classification offered by Dušková et al., that is, we shall use the term dependent imperative clause for a content *that*-clause, dependent on a *suasive* expression in the superordinate clause.

2.1.1. Semantic criteria for dependent imperative clauses

As mentioned above, Quirk et al. point out that the form of the verb phrase in a *that*-clause depends on the governing verb, or a corresponding adjective or noun, in the matrix clause. Two major semantic categories of verbs are distinguished – ‘factual’ and ‘*suasive*’ - and two minor ones – ‘emotional’ and ‘hypothesis’; depending on which of these is used in the main clause, the verb in the subordinate *that*-clause is expressed by the indicative (ex. 1), putative *should*, i.e., the *should*-construction (ex. 2) or the subjunctive (ex. 3).

- (1) I suppose that he *is coming* alone/ *will be coming* alone/ *will come* alone/ *has come* alone. (Quirk et al., 1985: 1180)
- (2) I regret that he *should be* so stubborn. (*ibid.*)
- (3) I request that she *go* alone. (*ibid.*)

As suasive expressions are usually followed by what we understand as dependent imperative clauses, we shall pay special attention to this category. Suasive verbs and related adjectives or nouns are described by Quirk et al. as implying “intentions to bring about some change in the future, whether or not these are verbally formulated as commands, suggestions, etc.” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1180) The superordinate clause containing this type of expressions can be followed by *that*-clauses with the subjunctive as well as by putative *should*; the indicative in such *that*-clauses is a variant restricted to British English. (*ibid.*: 1182) To illustrate the semantics of suasive verbs, let us present some examples²:

- (4) ‘I’m going to *suggest* that you talk to one of my colleagues in future,’ Dr Mackintosh said, keeping his temper. (AC3 2567)
- (5) If we *demand* that the faiths of others be tested, how can we refuse to test our own? (A2W 379)
- (6) Should we *insist* that children spend all their time with a literature whose main non-white representatives are Othello, Man Friday in Robinson Crusoe and the savages in Conrad’s Heart of Darkness? (CCV 1143)
- (7) He *ordered* that January, March, May, July, September and November should each have 31 days, the other months having 30 days, except February which should normally have 29 but in leap years would have 30. (ASF 806)
- (8) It’s *important* that you remain calm. (A0J 1278)
- (9) It was *inconceivable* that she shouldn’t be able to throw him off, but she couldn’t. (FPO 2348)
- (10) It is *vital* that you retain your dominance over your dog, and this dog shows clear signs of submissiveness. (CJE 637)

² Where Quirk et al. do not provide examples, sentences from the British National Corpus will be used. The initial alpha-numerical part of the code in the brackets following the example, e.g. AC3, refers to the text in the BNC, the latter number, e.g. 2567, indicates the number of the sentence in the text.

(11) He protested that we had made no *recommendation* that children should use Standard English. (CCV 439)

(12) The *requirement* that homes should be a haven of peace and rest for the male breadwinner has set up a tension with an architectural notion of "rationality" which proclaimed bare simplicity, tidiness, and the importance of cooking and cleaning as work processes. (J53 955)

The notion of suasive verbs is also described by Huddleston and Pullum but referred to as mandative verbs. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 999) The verb phrase in the dependent imperative clause governed by these may be labelled as the mandative construction.

2.2. Mandative construction

The adjective ‘mandative’ is a derivation from ‘mandate’, which comes from the original Latin verb *mandare*, meaning *to enjoin* or *to command*. (Serpellet, 2001: 532) It is essential to distinguish between mandative constructions and mandative expressions: Mandative constructions are understood as the verb forms generally included in subordinate *that*-clauses which are in relation to the suasive verbs in superordinate clauses; mandative expressions, on the other hand, refer to the verbs, adjectives and nouns expressing a demand, request, proposal, intention, suggestion, recommendation, etc., which may appear in main clauses (*ibid.*: 532), that is, suasive in the terminology of Quirk et al. mentioned above. According to Huddleston and Pullum, mandative constructions belong to the category of deontic modality, which, as opposed to epistemic modality, denotes obligation and permission.

Following Serpellet, we can distinguish four formal types of mandative constructions governed by mandative expressions: the mandative subjunctive (ex. 13), the mandative *should*-expression, i.e., putative *should* (ex. 14), the indicative (ex. 15), and what she refers to as ‘the non-distinctive form’ (ex. 16), where the subjunctive and the indicative are not formally distinguishable. (*ibid.*: 532-533)

- (13) She insisted that he *leave* early. (*ibid.*: 533)
- (14) I insisted that he *should take* part in part in the concert. (*ibid.*: 532)
- (15) She was eager that he *left* early. (*ibid.*: 533)
- (16) He suggests that we *leave* early. (*ibid.*)

The subjunctive in this construction is often formally identical with the indicative and is clearly distinguishable from it only in specific environments: firstly, the verb *be* has, unlike other verbs, indicative forms in all persons and numbers distinct from its base form and thus it always overtly differs from the subjunctive³ (ex. 17). Secondly, the subjunctive and the indicative contrast in all verbs if in third person singular in the present tense (ex. 18). Thirdly, the mandative subjunctive has the base form of the verb irrespective of sequence of tenses and thus, while the indicative forms are liable to backshifting, the subjunctive does not change its form and is therefore easily detectable in non-present tenses (ex. 19). Finally, the subjunctive does not take the *do*-operator in negative sentences; instead, the word *not* preceding the verb is used to express negation. The indicative, on the other hand, does require the operator and this is another aspect in which it can be formally distinguished from the subjunctive. (ex. 20)

- (17) It is important that the burden *be* shared. (Overgaard, 1995: 93)
- (18) I demand that he *hand in* a formal complaint. (*ibid.*)
- (19) He insisted that she *leave* the premises. (*ibid.*)
- (20) Her demand that we *not reveal* her identity was only to be expected. (*ibid.*)

³ The subjunctive is normally identical with the base form of the verb. See: 2.3.

2.2.1. Ambiguity between mandative and non-mandative

As mentioned above, the distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses can be neutralized. If this happens in constructions which follow expressions allowing both mandative and non-mandative complements (e.g. *insist*, *suggest*), ambiguity may arise. The verb *insist* has two meanings: it can be interpreted either as a suasive verb, meaning ‘to demand’ (ex. 21), or it can be understood as a factual verb, synonymous to ‘to declare firmly’ (ex. 22). Similarly, *suggest* can be semantically suasive, meaning ‘to propose’ (ex. 23), or factual, meaning ‘to mention as a possibility’ (ex. 24). (Overgaard, 1995: 63) Hence, these two verbs can be followed by clauses with mandative or non-mandative constructions, depending on the meaning they express. In some cases, we may not be able to determine whether the construction occurring in a *that*-clause after these verbs is mandative or non-mandative, unless we know the given context (ex. 25).

(21) She *insists* that he *take* the eight o’clock train. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 996)

(22) She *insists* that he *took* the eight o’clock train. (*ibid.*: 996)

(23) He *suggested* that John *lie* about their destination. (Overgaard, 1995: 63)

(24) He *suggested* that John *lied* about their destination. (*ibid.*: 63)

(25) She *insists* that he *takes*/ they *take* the eight o’clock train. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 996)

Insist in example (21) is clearly suasive, as it is followed by a dependent imperative clause containing a mandative construction with an overt subjunctive. Example (22), on the other hand, shows the factual meaning of the verb, expressing no volition and thus eliciting non-mandative complementation with the indicative. The *that*-clause following the factual *insist* is not to be understood as a dependent imperative clause, but rather as a dependent declarative one. Example (25) is ambiguous: *he takes* could be a covert mandative construction realized by the indicative, meaning “she insists on his taking this train, either on some particular occasion or habitually.”(*ibid.*: 996) The more likely interpretation,

however, is that *he takes* represents a non-mandative construction and that the whole sentence means that “she emphatically asserts it to be the case that he takes this train – most probably a matter of his habitually doing so, but it could be a single future occurrence with a futurate interpretation (‘She emphatically maintains that he is scheduled to take the eight o’clock train.’)” (*ibid.*:996) The version with *they take* is, in addition to having semantic ambiguity, also morphologically ambiguous, as we cannot decide whether the form is one of the subjunctive or the indicative. (*ibid.*:996)

2.3. Mandative subjunctive

The subjunctive as a verbal mood has undergone a great development in the history of the English language. In Old English, it played an important role as it had a distinct form and was used frequently to express uncertainty or doubt. “The indicative mood was used in OE only to denote an action the existence of which was taken for absolutely certain, subject to no doubt. On the other hand, the subjunctive mood denoted an action the existence of which was just uncertain, doubtful or merely possible. For this reason, subjunctive was commonly used also in sentences expressing wishes, sometimes also commands or prohibitions, etc.” (Vachek, 1991: 28) The subjunctive was also often used in dependent clauses following verbs of saying or in clauses of concession. (Baker, 2003: 83-5) As the inflectional endings were generally reduced phonetically or entirely lost in the Middle English period, the subjunctive and the indicative became formally indistinct; consequently, the subjunctive came to be functionally inefficient and gradually replaced with periphrastic variants. In Modern English, the subjunctive as a grammatical category became restricted to specific contexts or registers. (Vachek and Firbas, 1994: 222-3)

Considering the status of the subjunctive in present-day English, the question often arises whether it can still be considered a mood, equal to the indicative, the imperative and the conditional. (James, 1986: 1) Some grammarians, including Huddleston and Pullum, approach it rather as a syntactic construction of a clause which is finite but insensitive to tense and which contains the verb in its base form. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 993) Nevertheless, as Quirk et al. state, “the subjunctive in modern English is generally an optional and stylistically somewhat marked variant of other constructions, but it is not so unimportant as is sometimes suggested.” (Quirk et al., 1985: 155)

The mandative subjunctive is one of the two main types of the present⁴ subjunctive, the other being the formulaic subjunctive, whose use is limited to certain fixed expressions generally in the form of an independent clause (*God save the Queen*, *Suffice it to say that ...*, *Heaven forbid*). The mandative subjunctive is considered to be the most common type; it is realized by the base form of the verb and its occurrence is restricted mainly to dependent *that*-clauses. “The mandative subjunctive is productive in that it can be used with any verb in a *that*-clause when the superordinate clause satisfies the requisite semantic condition, viz that the *that*-clause be introduced by an expression of demand, recommendation, proposal, resolution, intention, etc.⁵ This expression takes the form of a verb, an adjective, or a noun.”(ibid.: 156) The subjunctive can also appear in subordinate clauses introduced by *if*, *unless*, *lest*, *whether*, etc.; however, the term ‘mandative’ is used exclusively in reference to the constructions described above. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 993) In addition to putative *should* and the indicative, it frequently alternates with the infinitive clause.

2.4. Putative *should*

In main clauses, the modal *should* is similar to *must* in that it is a means of expressing deontic and in some cases also epistemic modality. The deontic *should* implies mainly obligation and a lower degree of necessity. (Dušková et al., 2006: 195) In dependent imperative clauses, it functions as an alternative to the mandative subjunctive and is referred to as the ‘periphrastic subjunctive’ or ‘putative *should*’. Quirk et al. provide the following definition: “Putative *should* is used in *that*-clauses when the matrix clauses contain verbs, adjectives or nouns that convey an emotional reaction or that express a necessity, plan, or intention for the future.” (Quirk et al., 1985: 1014) It may also appear in *that*-clauses to express a putative situation, which is to be understood as ‘possibly existing’ or coming to existence’ (*I am surprised that he should feel lonely*), or in a construction similar in meaning to conditional clauses (*It’s a pity that they should be so obstinate* equals the meaning of *It’s a pity if they are so obstinate*). Putative *should* further occurs in some main clauses with idiomatic meaning (*How should I know?*). Conditional *if*-clauses

⁴ Beside the present subjunctive, there is another form of the subjunctive, the past subjunctive, (also called the *were*-subjunctive), which is extremely limited as it survives only in the past tense of the verb *be* (*were*). It is typically used in dependent adverbial clauses of condition or concession (e.g. *If I were rich, I would...*), or in nominal content clauses introduced by the verbs *wish*, *suppose*, etc. (Quirk et al., 1985: 155-8)

⁵ In the present thesis, we call these clauses dependent imperative.

sometimes contain verb phrases with *should*, however, these are to be distinguished from the periphrastic subjunctive, as they denote tentativeness rather than a putative meaning. (*ibid.*)

2.5. Indicative

The indicative is the most usual verb form in subordinate *that*-clauses; it usually co-occurs with the superordinate verbs of the factual and emotive semantic category as distinguished by Quirk et al., and is supposed to express ‘factual information.’ It can also appear in *that*-clauses introduced by *suasive* verbs, that is, in dependent imperative clauses, where the subjunctive or putative *should* are normally expected, but this use of the indicative is largely limited and is found predominantly in BrE. (Quirk et al., 1985: 1180) Overgaard argues that the use of the indicative rather than mandative subjunctive or putative *should* in these clauses implies that the speaker “minimizes the volitional element, and the noun clause⁶ is turned into an ordinary instruction (ex. 26) [...] or a comment on a current fact which may or may not express a personal opinion (ex. 27, 28) [...]” (Overgaard, 1995: 63)

(26) [...] and it is essential that the ripening is stopped at the correct degree of acidity [...] (*ibid.*: 62)

(27) It is recommended that the saline [...] techniques are used in parallel. (*ibid.*: 62)

(28) This requires that money lodged in pre-paid schemes is kept in separate trusts. (*ibid.*: 62)

Overgaard further suggests that the ongoing use of the indicative in dependent imperative clauses may eventually lead to analogical levelling of the mandative subjunctive in BrE. The contributing factors to such a development may be the opacity caused by the fact that most of the forms of the present indicative and subjunctive are identical, and the minimal use of mandative sentences. (*ibid.*: 67)

⁶ Dependent imperative clause

2.6. Mandative subjunctive versus putative *should* and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses

2.6.1. Distribution according to register

In English grammars of the 20th century, the subjunctive is typically claimed to be an archaism in BrE, used only in literary texts; it is described as rare, unnatural, legal and formal, found mainly in official style. (Overgaard, 1995: 37-38) According to Johansson and Norheim, the mandative subjunctive often co-occurs with the passive in BrE, which confirms the assumption about the subjunctive being used predominantly in formal environments, because “as is well-known, the passive is characteristic of formal, impersonal prose.” (Johansson and Norheim, 1988: 30) The putative *should*, on the other hand, is generally believed to be the most proper option in mandative constructions.

The problem, however, is that the majority of the 20th century grammarians comply with scholars of the 1920s and 1930s, or rely on older corpora, and fail to notice the changes happening in the language, specifically that the use of the mandative subjunctive has been growing since the beginning of the second half of the 20th century and that this type of the subjunctive is very much alive in present day English. (Overgaard, 1995: 58) Recent studies show that the mandative subjunctive is used extensively in AmE as well as in BrE, including colloquial language. (Serpellet, 2001: 541)

2.6.2. Distribution according to dialect

Mandative subjunctive has been generally thought to be a distinctive feature of AmE⁷, where it is used frequently, while the speakers of BrE opt for it rarely, mostly in formal contexts, and incline to replace it with the alternative putative *should*. It has been also argued that the subjunctive is dying out in BrE, but it appears that it is in fact coming

⁷ Overgaard mentions that the mandative subjunctive was not dominant in AmE until 1920s. Before the First World War, it was mostly confined to the Mid-West and the South of the United States, while speakers from the North-East usually preferred the periphrastic variant, which may be explained by the fact that the population of the Western and Southern regions was largely made up of immigrants whose first language commonly used the subjunctive mood, and who thus preferred the old subjunctive form when speaking English; Northeast Americans, on the other hand, probably still looked up to Britain and considered the British dialect and its specific features the proper English. (Overgaard, 1995: 40-8) The reason for the increase of mandative subjunctive in AmE after the First World War might be the rise of the United States as a world power and its consequent gain of prestige: as AmE became more prestigious, its speakers began preferring features peculiar to this regional variant to the supposedly correct British forms (a phenomenon similar to the use of the rhotic and non-rhotic accents in AmE).

back to this regional variety.⁸ Quirk et al. state: “There are indications ... that it [subjunctive] is reestablishing itself in BrE, probably as a result of AmE influence.” (Quirk et al., 1985: 157)

According to Overgaard, BrE of the first half of the 20th century showed rare instances of the mandative subjunctive, but this changed rapidly after the Second World War, possibly because of the vast development of the mass media, which caused that various texts written in AmE became widely available in Europe. The impact of these texts on BrE may have been so great as to initiate the renewal of the mandative subjunctive in everyday language.

Similarly to Overgaard, Serpollet ascribes this change in BrE to Americanization: “... AmE is more innovative than BrE in ongoing morphological and syntactical changes. Therefore, it would influence BrE and would lead to Americanization of the language.” (Serpollet, 2001: 541) Serpollet also mentions two other possible reasons for the increasing use of the subjunctive in the variety of BrE: grammaticalization and colloquialization. To contrast these two, she provides a view by Mair, who interprets the changes in the English language (e.g. frequent use of the progressive and the *going-to* construction for expressing the future, great increase in the use of contracted forms) not as significant grammatical changes, but rather as the development of forms which have been available in the language for a long time and are used more frequently today than they would have been decades ago, thus preferring colloquialization to pure grammaticalization, where a syntactic construction would be replaced by an older morphological form. Serpollet, however, raises the question whether this argument can be applied to the rise of the mandative subjunctive in BrE, which used to be restricted to formal register. (*ibid.*: 541-542)

As it has been mentioned in a previous section, the indicative as a mandative construction is a Britishism. It is commonly used in BrE (Quirk et al, 1985: 1180); in AmE, however, the indicative in this position is mostly disliked and felt to be unacceptable. (Overgaard, 1995: 65)⁹

⁸ Mair speaks of the “unexpected revival of a near-defunct grammatical category, the mandative subjunctive.” (Mair, 2006: 193)

⁹ One instance is known where, in fact, an indicative in a British text is replaced by a mandative subjunctive in its American edition. (Overgaard, 1995: 65)

3. Research project

The research project of the present study consists of two parts: a diachronic one, predominantly quantitative, and a synchronic one, a detailed qualitative analysis. The diachronic part of the project observes the development of the use of mandative subjunctive and putative *should* in BrE in the second half of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century. The synchronic part attempts to trace some tendencies in the distribution of the paradigmatic variants in dependent imperative clauses, i.e., mandative subjunctive, putative *should* and the indicative, in contemporary BrE. Both parts of the project focus exclusively on written English.

3.1. Objectives and hypotheses

3.1.1. Diachronic research

As we have mentioned in Chapter 2, previous studies and secondary literature indicate that there has been a growing tendency to use the mandative subjunctive at the expense of its periphrastic variant with putative *should* in BrE since the beginning of the latter half of the 20th century. The objective of the diachronic research of the present study was to investigate the representation of the mandative subjunctive and constructions with *should* in dependent imperative clauses in BrE in the course of the second half of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century.

3.1.2. Synchronic research

The main purpose of the synchronic part of the research project was to examine the use of the three possible variants in dependent imperative clauses in contemporary BrE and to detect if there are any specific environments in which putative *should* is more likely to occur than the mandative subjunctive or the indicative, and vice versa. On the basis of our observations from the analysis of the data for the diachronic research, and also drawing on the findings presented in secondary literature, we reached the following hypotheses:

- The choice of the verb form in the dependent imperative clause might depend on the semantics of the suasive verb in the governing clause: the suasive verbs denoting a

command (e.g. *demand, require, insist, order, request*) appear to be complemented by the subjunctive or the indicative more frequently than the suasive verbs denoting a suggestion (e.g. *suggest, recommend, propose*), which would be followed rather by the periphrastic variant, with *should* expressing not only sentence modality, but also deontic modality indicating advisability¹⁰.

- *Suggest* as the governing verb of dependent imperative clauses seems to differ from other suasive verbs in that it tends to occur mostly with putative *should*, less with the subjunctive, and very rarely with the indicative.
- The structure of the subject of the dependent imperative clause may be another factor influencing the choice of the form of the verb in the predicate. Simple subjects (i.e., pronouns or noun phrases consisting of merely the head and determiner with no modification) seem to occur predominantly with the subjunctive or the indicative, whereas complex subjects (i.e., noun phrases with modification) seem to occur mostly together with putative *should* in the predicate.
- Another factor might be the form of the governing suasive verb.
- The lexical choice of the verb in the predicate of the dependent imperative clause may also partly account for the choice of the particular mandative construction.¹¹
- The choice between the mandative subjunctive, putative *should*, and the indicative in the dependent imperative clause might also depend on the genre of the text in which the sentence is found.¹²

The synchronic research aimed to confirm or disprove the hypotheses stated above and to draw some conclusions about the distribution primarily of the subjunctive and putative *should* in mandative constructions.

¹⁰ I.e., lower degree of necessity (Dušková et al., 2006: 195)

¹¹ Quirk et al., for example, state that the verb *be*, when in complementation of a suasive expression, is used in the subjunctive form more frequently than other verbs in this position: “there is a tendency in BrE to choose the subjunctive more especially when the finite verb is BE ...” (Quirk et al., 1985: 157)

¹² According to Serpollet, the genre category which experienced the highest increase in the mandative subjunctive between the 1960s and 1990s was learned prose; the category of press, on the other hand, underwent the least change in the frequency of the use of the mandative subjunctive. (Serpollet, 2001: 540) We may thus expect a high number of constructions with the mandative subjunctive in instances from learned prose, but only a few in those from the press category.

3.2. Material

The study draws on four different corpora of BrE to obtain the primary material for the research project. For the diachronic part of the project, three diachronically comparable corpora, matching roughly in size and composition,¹³ have been used: the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus (LOB), compiled by Geoffrey Leech et al., containing written texts published in 1961; the Freiburg-LOB Corpus (FLOB), compiled by Christian Mair et al., representing BrE of the early 1990s; and the recent British English 2006 Corpus (BE06), compiled by Paul Baker, consisting of written texts published between the years 2003 and 2008, thus covering BrE of the early 21st century. The material from the LOB and FLOB corpora was analyzed using the *Antconc* concordance program; the BE06 corpus was accessed via the Corpus Query Processor system at Lancaster University.

For the synchronic part of the project, the British National Corpus (BNC)¹⁴ has been used, a collection of written and spoken texts of BrE recorded in the late 20th century. The BNC was accessed via BNCweb at Lancaster University.

3.3. Methods

For both parts of the research project in the present study, we adapted basic corpus linguistic tools and methods in collecting the data. Especially in the qualitative part, these methods had to be complemented by manual analysis.

3.3.1. Method used in the diachronic research

For the diachronic part of the project, we examined a number of suasive expressions complemented by a dependent imperative clause in each of the given corpora respectively. To select the expressions for the analysis, we searched the BE06 corpus for left collocates of constructions consisting of *that* as a conjunction, followed, not necessarily immediately, by *should*¹⁵; we subsequently examined the retrieved material and manually excluded the instances which were irrelevant for our research. Out of the most

¹³ Each corpus contains 500 files (each one consisting of approximately 2,000 words) subdivided into 15 genre categories, altogether making about 1 million words.

¹⁴ The British National Corpus consists of approximately 100 million words.

¹⁵ The following query was entered: “_CST >>10>>should“, and the collocation process was carried out by corpus tools.

frequent relevant expressions, the following were selected for further analysis: *ask*, *demand*, *essential*, *important*, *insist*, *necessary*, *propose*, *recommend*, *request*, *require*, *suggest* and *urge*. These were then searched for individually in all their morphological forms in BE06 as well as the LOB and FLOB corpora¹⁶; the extracted instances were examined and pertinent examples, i.e. sentences where the respective expression is followed by a dependent imperative clause, were collected and recorded.¹⁷

The excerpted material was sorted into four groups according to the type of mandative construction appearing in each sentence: subjunctive, putative *should*, indicative and ambiguous.¹⁸ Finally, the ultimate numbers of occurrences of each of the paradigmatic variants in LOB, FLOB and BE06 were taken down and the frequencies of the particular items in each corpus were compared.

3.3.2. Method used in the synchronic research

When analyzing the retrieved instances of the mandative subjunctive, putative *should* and the indicative from the texts of BE06, we arrived at some hypotheses about the use and distribution of these variants in contemporary BrE. However, the data collected from the BE06 corpus are scarce and not sufficient for us to be able to arrive at sound conclusions. To verify our assumptions and reach some judgment, we had to rely on a corpus larger than BE06. The BNC was chosen as the primary source for this part of the project because of its large size.

Having considered the findings from the diachronic research and the derived hypotheses (formulated above), we selected four suasive verbs for detailed analysis: two expressing a command – *demand*, *require* – and two expressing a suggestion – *suggest*, *recommend*. Each of them was searched for in all its forms in the BNC but the search was

¹⁶ As the corpora used for the diachronic research are very small, where possible, we included the corresponding nouns and adjectives of the selected verbs in the analysis in order to increase the number of instances.

¹⁷ It was especially necessary to analyze carefully the instances with the expressions *suggest*, *insist* and *important* in the superordinate clause, which can be followed by dependent imperative as well as dependent declarative clauses.

¹⁸ ‘Ambiguous’ indicates the instances where it is impossible to tell whether the verb form is that of subjunctive or indicative (e.g. It is important that you take steps to manage your debt. BE06, F37) See also: Chapter 2.2.

limited to occurrences of these verbs when immediately followed by the conjunction *that*.¹⁹

20

A further excerption of relevant examples was made from the retrieved hits displayed in random order: we recorded all instances of the respective suasive verb followed by any type of mandative construction until the number of overt mandatives, i.e. mandative subjunctive or putative *should*, reached 50.²¹ The indicative and ambiguous constructions were also recorded in the process, and their numbers noted. The focus, however, was on the overt mandatives. The excerpted examples were examined and each was described according to the following criteria:

- The type of mandative construction in the dependent imperative clause: the mandative subjunctive, putative *should*, the indicative²² and the non-distinctive, or ambiguous, form.
- The verb constituting the mandative construction: e.g. *be*, *become*, *make*, *pay*.
- The structure of the subject of the dependent clause: pronoun, simple noun phrase, complex noun phrase, complex noun phrase with postmodification,²³ and complex noun phrase consisting of two coordinate heads or two coordinated noun phrases.
- The form of the verb making up the predicate of the superordinate clause: base form, present participle, past participle, 3rd person singular of the present tense.
- The type of text the example comes from: learned prose, general prose, press and fiction.²⁴

¹⁹ The query used was the following: “{SUASIVE VERB/V} _CJT” (e.g. {suggest/V} _CJT)

²⁰ We are aware of having narrowed the scope of the study by focusing in the query only on dependent clauses introduced by the conjunction *that*, disregarding those with juxtaposition. The query, however, appears to have retrieved a sufficient number of relevant mandative constructions.

²¹ Following Hudleston and Pullum, we do not include the indicative as an overt mandative here, but we understand it as a covert one, as the structure of these is formally not distinguishable from other, non-mandative, clauses, and their mandative meanings are dependent on the governing verbs. (Hudleston and Pullum, 2002: 995)

²² Among the indicative forms we included also the instances where the verb form of the predicate of the dependent clause is represented by a modal verb other than *should* and the infinitive.

²³ The complex noun phrase contains only premodification and no postmodification, while the complex noun phrase with postmodification contains postmodification and may or may not contain premodification.

²⁴ We use these categories adhering roughly to Serpollet’s classification of genres: Learned Prose = academic writing and institutional or government documents; general prose = non-academic, miscellaneous, commercial, popular and religious writing; press = news (script and broadsheet); fiction.

3.4. Research data

3.4.1. Presentation and discussion of the diachronic research data

The tables presented below show the frequencies of individual types of mandative constructions after selected suasive expressions²⁵ in the BE06, FLOB and LOB corpora.²⁶ A discussion of the principal results follows.

Table 1: Suggest or suggestion

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	6	25.0	9	37.5	9	37.5	0	0.0	24	100.0
FLOB	1	4.6	13	59.1	8	36.4	0	0.0	22	100.0
LOB	2	4.8	32	76.2	6	14.3	2	4.8	42	100.0

Table 2: Recommend or recommendation

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	2	13.3	6	40.0	5	33.3	2	13.3	15	100.0
FLOB	1	6.3	14	87.5	0	0.0	1	6.3	16	100.0
LOB	5	22.8	13	59.1	3	13.6	1	4.6	22	100.0

Table 3: Demand (verb and noun)

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	6	37.5	2	12.5	6	37.5	2	12.5	16	100.0
FLOB	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
LOB	5	35.7	6	42.9	1	7.1	2	14.3	14	100.0

Table 4: Important

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	1	5.3	1	5.3	9	47.4	8	42.1	19	100.0
FLOB	0	0.0	11	91.7	1	8.3	0	0.0	12	100.0
LOB	2	20.0	4	40.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	10	100.0

²⁵ See: 3.3.1.

²⁶ The percentage numbers in all tables are rounded to the nearest tenths.

Table 5: Ask

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
FLOB	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
LOB	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0

Table 6: Essential

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	5	100.0
FLOB	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100.0
LOB	0	0.0	7	77.8	0	0.0	2	22.2	9	100.0

Table 7: Insist, insistence or insistent

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
FLOB	1	14.3	2	28.6	2	28.6	2	28.6	7	100.0
LOB	1	11.1	7	77.8	0	0.0	1	11.1	9	100.0

Table 8: Necessary

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
FLOB	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
LOB	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	5	100.0

Table 9: Propose

	subjunctive		should		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
FLOB	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
LOB	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	100.0

Table 10: Request (verb and noun)

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	2	100.0
FLOB	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	100.0
LOB	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0

Table 11: Require or requirement

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
FLOB	6	42.9	1	7.1	1	7.1	6	42.9	14	100.0
LOB	1	14.3	4	57.1	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	100.0

Table 12: Urge

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
BE06	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
FLOB	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
LOB	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7	3	100.0

Although the absolute numbers are very small, we can draw some conclusions on the basis of the information given by the relative numbers. The results show that there has been a general decrease in the relative representation of putative *should* in comparison with other mandative constructions between the 1960s and 2000s: e.g., the overall number of occurrences of putative *should* in dependent imperative clauses following the expressions *suggest* and *suggestion* makes up 76.2% of all mandative constructions in the LOB corpus; in the FLOB corpus it drops to 59.1%, and finally in the BE06 corpus it represents only 37.5%. At the same time, the relative representation of the mandative subjunctive after these expressions increases (from 4.8% and 4.6% in LOB and FLOB, respectively, to 25% in BE06), although it does not exceed that of putative *should*.

The results obtained from the three corpora seem to suggest an overall increase in the mandative subjunctive and its general predominance in present-day BrE; yet, a closer analysis of the data shows that the frequency of the mandative subjunctive in the instances from BE06 is not always greater than in LOB or FLOB, nor does it necessarily surpass the occurrences of putative *should*.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the number of instances of dependent imperative clauses with the ambiguous, non-distinct form of the verb – which cannot be clearly identified as either the subjunctive or the indicative, but may represent the mandative subjunctive – has generally increased. It is also important to realize after which suasive expressions the constructions with putative *should* prevail in the examples from the BE06 corpus: these are *suggest*, *insist* and *recommend*. The frequent use of putative *should* rather than the subjunctive after *suggest* and *insist* may be the result not of the persisting preference of this periphrastic variant in dependent imperative clauses, but rather of the tendency to disambiguate dependent imperative clauses clearly from dependent declarative ones.²⁷

Interestingly, dependent imperative clauses following the verb or noun *request* have not experienced a decrease in putative *should*: the frequency of *should* after these expressions was low to begin with and the predominant mandative construction is the mandative subjunctive in the LOB as well as in the FLOB and BE06 corpora. This may be explained by the fact that *request* is generally connected with formal contexts, and as the subjunctive used to be associated primarily with formal style²⁸, the expression *request* may have been automatically complemented by the subjunctive rather than putative *should* even before the mandative subjunctive started increasing in BrE. However, the number of instances of dependent imperative clauses following *request* in our analysis is too small and further research would have to be carried out for a definitive statement to be made.

²⁷ See: 2.2.1

²⁸ See: 2.5.1

3.4.3. Presentation and discussion of the synchronic research data

The sections which follow present tables showing the distribution of the mandative subjunctive, putative *should*, the ambiguous non-distinct form and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses in the excerpted instances from the BNC. The first section presents overall frequencies of these mandative constructions after the expressions *suggest*, *recommend*, *demand* and *require*. The subsequent sections give the results of the frequencies in different environments individually for each of the selected suasive expressions. Each section is complemented by a discussion.

3.4.3.1. Overall distribution

Table 13: *Suggest, recommend, demand, require (overall distribution)*

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		Ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Suggest	11	16.9	39	60.0	11	16.9	4	6.2	65	100.0
Recommend	30	44.8	20	29.9	11	16.4	6	9.0	67	100.0
Demand	37	57.8	13	20.3	4	6.3	10	15.6	64	100.0
Require	30	33.0	20	22.0	14	15.4	27	29.7	91	100.0

The results of the overall distribution of mandative constructions support our theory that the verb *suggest* followed by a dependent imperative clause differs significantly from other suasive expressions. While the other analyzed verbs - *recommend*, *demand* and *require* – comply with the assumption of the developing dominance of the subjunctive in dependent imperative clauses in BrE, using the mandative subjunctive more frequently than the *should*-construction, *suggest* presents a general preference for putative *should* over the subjunctive.

All the analyzed verbs save *suggest* show similar frequencies of putative *should* in the dependent imperative clauses following them; *suggest*, on the other hand, presents a number of constructions with *should* twice to three times as high as each of the verbs. Conversely, the frequency of constructions with the mandative subjunctive after *suggest* is remarkably lower than is the case after the other verbs in the analysis. Furthermore, the indicative in dependent imperative clauses following *suggest* is quite rare, although the low frequency of indicatives after suasive expressions is not particularly unusual (e.g. the

frequency of ‘mandative’ indicatives for the suasive verb *recommend* is higher than for *suggest* by less than 3%).

The phenomenon of the uncommonly high number of constructions with putative *should* and the simultaneous low number of mandative subjunctives and indicatives following *suggest* is most probably due to the twofold semantics of the verb *suggest*, which can function either as a suasive or a factual verb, thus allowing the dependent imperative (ex.1) as well as the dependent declarative clause (ex.2) as its complementation.²⁹

(1) There was still an hour to wait so the Feldwebel *suggested* that we should have some coffee. (B0U 854)³⁰

(2) Dr Edwin Latham *suggested* that Joseph ‘died of a broken heart’. (ALX 1016)

Speakers may tend to prefer putative *should* after the suasive *suggest*, that is, in dependent imperative clauses, to explicitly express the mandative meaning of the clause, and at the same time they may avoid using the subjunctive and the indicative in this environment as it could lead to semantic ambiguity and possibly to misinterpretation by the recipient if in the position where the difference between the subjunctive and the indicative is neutralized. (ex.3)

(3) I am not *suggesting* that you take this model too seriously. (H10 1033)

The assumption that the dependent imperative clauses which follow suasive expressions denoting a suggestion occur with putative *should* more frequently than those which follow expressions denoting a command was not sufficiently confirmed. Although there is a considerably high frequency of mandative constructions with *should* after the suasive verb *suggest*, the reason for this is presumably not the ‘suggestive’ meaning of the verb, but rather its complex nature described above. The other analyzed verb expressing a suggestion, *recommend*, does not show an exceptionally large number of putative *should* in

²⁹ See: 2.2.1

³⁰ The examples provided in this section come from the British National Corpus.

dependent imperative clauses following it; however, the number is still higher than for the verbs expressing a demand (compared with the results for the verb *demand*, the frequency of *should*-constructions for *recommend* is higher by almost 10%).

Attention may be drawn to the verb *demand*, which shows a strong representation of mandative subjunctives in dependent imperative clauses. This may be seen as a sign of the verb generally preferring the mandative subjunctive to the other variants in its complementation. However, the frequency of constructions with putative *should* is not significantly low, nor is the frequency of indicatives. More importantly, the number of ambiguous forms for *demand* is quite small (about 2.5 times smaller than for the other analyzed verbs), which suggests that rather than being complemented by the mandative subjunctive more often than other expressions are, the verb *demand* in our research happens to appear in examples where the variants in dependent imperative clauses are mostly identifiable, providing a greater number of genuine, i.e. unambiguous, mandative subjunctives than the other verbs, whose examples from the BNC contain a large quantity of ambiguous, non-distinctive forms, which cannot be unequivocally labelled as the subjunctive but can in fact represent it.

3.4.3.2. Distribution with respect to the structure of the subject of the dependent clause

Table 14³¹: *Suggest (subject)*

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		Ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Pronoun	3	15.8	5	26.3	9	47.4	2	10.5	19	100.0
NPS	4	13.8	21	72.4	2	6.9	2	6.9	29	100.0
NPC	3	37.5	5	62.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	100.0
NPCP	1	12.5	7	87.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	100.0
NPCC	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0

Table 15: *Recommend (subject)*

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		Ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Pronoun	4	33.3	2	16.7	5	41.7	1	8.3	12	100.0
NPS	16	48.5	9	27.3	6	18.2	2	6.1	33	100.0
NPC	5	55.6	3	33.3	0	0.0	1	11.1	9	100.0
NPCP	5	38.5	6	46.2	0	0.0	2	15.4	13	100.0
NPCC	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 16: *Demand (subject)*

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Pronoun	8	53.3	2	13.3	2	13.3	3	20.0	15	100.0
NPS	16	59.3	4	14.8	2	7.4	5	18.5	27	100.0
NPC	6	60.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	100.0
NPCP	5	50.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	10	100.0
NPCC	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0

Table 17: *Require (subject)*

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Pronoun	2	14.3	2	14.3	6	42.9	4	28.6	14	100.0
NPS	17	48.6	7	20.0	4	11.4	7	20.0	35	100.0
NPC	3	25.0	2	16.7	2	16.7	5	41.7	12	100.0
NPCP	5	25.0	7	35.0	1	5.0	7	35.0	20	100.0
NPCC	3	33.3	2	22.2	1	11.1	3	33.3	9	100.0

³¹ The abbreviations in the tables of this section stand for: simple noun phrase (NPS), complex noun phrase (NPC), complex noun phrase with postmodification (NPCP) and complex coordinated noun phrase (NPCC). See: 3.3.2.

The results indicate that the structure of the subject of the dependent imperative clause does influence the form of the verb in the predicate to a certain extent. According to the data presented above, there seems to be a tendency to use putative *should* abundantly (although not necessarily more frequently than other constructions) when the subject is a complex noun phrase (ex. 4), and on the other hand, to use it minimally when the subject is a pronoun (ex. 5, 6).

(4) It is required that the text and control data available to the users *should* be up to date. (EAS 194)

(5) The radio cannot demand that we *listen* to it: even if we leave it switched on, this does not mean we are listening. (CDU 1059)

(6) All night ticket collectors came with torches, and they were followed by police who demanded that I *put on* proper trousers. (FBL 1091)

For all the analyzed verbs, the number of constructions with *should* occurring with a pronoun in the subject is at least 2.2 times lower than the number of these constructions with the subject being a complex noun phrase with postmodification. It cannot be asserted that the mandative subjunctive is more frequent in environments where the subject is a pronoun (as it might be perhaps expected) since the number of subjunctives is not higher than in the other categories of the structure of the subject. Nevertheless, this could be, again, explained by the fact that the pronoun category comprises an exceptionally great quantity of ambiguous constructions (the percentage of non-distinct forms in the category of pronouns is 36.3 on the average, while the other categories show only 5.5 on the average.)

We can notice the remarkably large number of *should*-constructions for the verb *suggest*: whatever the structure of the subject, the frequency of constructions with putative *should* in the predicate is always significantly higher than the frequency of mandative subjunctives, which does not apply for any other suasive verb in our analysis. This supports our earlier statement that *suggest* as a suasive expression is very distinctive as it generally prefers putative *should* in dependent imperative clauses following it.

3.4.3.3. Distribution with respect to the verb in the dependent clause

Table 18: *Suggest* (verb in the dependent clause)

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Be	5	21.7	18	78.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0
Other Verb	6	14.3	21	50.0	11	26.2	4	9.5	42	100.0

Table 19: *Recommend* (verb in the dependent clause)

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Be	23	53.5	15	34.9	0	0.0	5	11.6	43	100.0
Other Verb	7	29.2	5	20.8	11	45.8	1	4.2	24	100.0

Table 20: *Demand* (verb in the dependent clause)

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Be	22	71.0	6	19.4	0	0.0	3	9.7	31	100.0
Other Verb	15	45.5	7	21.2	4	12.1	7	21.2	33	100.0

Table 21: *Require* (verb in the dependent clause)

	Subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Be	22	46.8	14	29.8	0	0.0	11	23.4	47	100.0
Other Verb	8	18.2	6	13.6	14	31.8	16	36.4	44	100.0

Concerning the influence of the verb in the dependent clause, the results show a generally high frequency of mandative subjunctives when the verb is *be* (ex. 7), which is – for each of the analyzed verbs – significantly higher than the frequency of subjunctives used with other verbs (ex. 8).

(7) It has been *suggested* that the course of the walk be changed yet again. (BPK 717)

(8) A Bill's been introduced into the Commons, which would *require* that before people are tattooed, they should take out an insurance policy against its removal. (K1S 3362)

This could imply that the tendency to use the mandative subjunctive construction is markedly more pronounced when the verb in the dependent clause is *be* than with other verbs, as has been earlier suggested by Quirk et al.³² It is important to note, however, that the verb *be* cannot occur in the ambiguous, non-distinct form: unlike any other verb, it has a unique base form, which is different from all indicative forms, and therefore its subjunctive can be always clearly identified and distinguished from the indicative. The results might be distorted by this as other verbs appear in the non-distinct form frequently and the relatively lower number of overt mandative subjunctive constructions used with these verbs may be due to the fact that these verbs occur frequently in mandative constructions where the predicate verb is indeterminate between the subjunctive and the indicative. Moreover, the results show that putative *should* is also quite often used with *be* –in fact, more frequently than with other verbs.³³

As in the previous sections, there is clear preference for putative *should* in the dependent imperative clause when the verb in the matrix clause is the suasive *suggest*.

3.4.3.4. Distribution with respect to the form of the verb in the main clause

Table 22: *Suggest* (verb in the main clause)

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
3rd person singular	0	0.0	9	90.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	10	100.0
Past Participle	7	23.3	18	60.0	1	3.3	4	13.3	30	100.0
Present Participle	0	0.0	5	71.4	2	28.6	0	0.0	7	100.0
Base Form	4	22.2	7	38.9	7	38.9	0	0.0	18	100.0

Table 23: *Recommend* (verb in the main clause)

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
3rd person singular	3	42.9	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0.0	7	100.0
Past Participle	21	48.8	15	34.9	1	2.3	6	14.0	43	100.0
Present Participle	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	0	0.0	6	100.0
Base Form	3	27.3	2	18.2	6	54.6	0	0.0	11	100.0

³² See: 3.1.2

³³ This holds for *suggest*, *recommend* and *require*. The exception is *demand*, where the frequency of *should*-constructions with the verb *be* is somewhat smaller than it is with other verbs.

Table 24: Demand (verb in the main clause)

	subjunctive		<i>Should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
3rd person singular	6	40.0	3	20.0	1	6.7	5	33.3	15	100.0
Past Participle	24	82.8	3	10.3	0	0.0	2	6.9	29	100.0
Present Participle	6	50.0	4	33.3	0	0.0	2	16.7	12	100.0
Base Form	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	8	100.0

Table 25: Require (verb in the main clause)

	subjunctive		<i>Should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
3rd person singular	10	22.7	8	18.2	8	18.2	18	40.9	44	100.0
Past Participle	7	50.0	5	35.7	0	0.0	2	14.3	14	100.0
Present Participle	3	60.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	5	100.0
Base Form	10	35.7	7	25.0	5	17.9	6	21.4	28	100.0

In the results of the distribution with respect to the form of the verb in the main clause, no significant tendencies have been detected. What is worth noting, however, is that the indicative – in the backshifted form – occurs as a mandative construction in dependent imperative clauses in the past, that is, after governing suasive verbs which have the form of the past participle. (ex. 9, 10) According to Overgaard, this may suggest the development of levelling³⁴ of the mandative subjunctive in BrE.³⁵

(9) The imperatives of competitive politics *required* that you ran flat-out from the start. (A5K 296)

(10) The growing fashion for child-centred education *demand*ed that classrooms became learning centres rather than lecture theatres. (CLY 1675)

Again, the exceptionally high frequency of constructions with putative *should* for the verb *suggest* is apparent.

³⁴ See: 2.5.

³⁵ Overgaard states: “Once levelling has been established in present tense context ... it can move on to past contexts, which ... is beginning to take place in BrE.” (Overgaard, 1995: 67)

3.4.3.5. Distribution with respect to genre category

Table 26: *Suggest (genre)*

	subjunctive		<i>Should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Press	0	0.0	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	100.0
Fiction	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
General Prose	6	15.8	20	52.6	9	23.7	3	7.9	38	100.0
Learned Prose	4	26.7	11	73.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	100.0

Table 27: *Recommend (genre)*

	subjunctive		<i>Should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Press	11	50.0	9	40.9	2	9.1	0	0.0	22	100.0
Fiction	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
General Prose	14	48.3	4	13.8	7	24.1	4	13.8	29	100.0
Learned Prose	5	31.3	7	43.8	2	12.5	2	12.5	16	100.0

Table 28: *Demand (genre)*

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Press	5	83.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	6	100.0
Fiction	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
General Prose	25	61.0	8	19.5	3	7.3	5	12.2	41	100.0
Learned Prose	5	38.5	3	23.1	1	7.7	4	30.8	13	100.0

Table 29: *Require (genre)*

	subjunctive		<i>should</i>		ambiguous		Indicative		TOTAL	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
Press	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
Fiction	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
General Prose	13	31.0	9	21.4	8	19.1	12	28.6	42	100.0
Learned Prose	16	36.4	9	20.5	5	11.4	14	31.8	44	100.0

Our expectation, based on Serpollet's study, of a high frequency of mandative subjunctives in learned prose and a significantly lower one in press was not confirmed as there seems to be no regularity in using the subjunctive or putative *should* in these specific genre categories among the analyzed expressions. No other general tendencies were noted. What can be perhaps noticed is the absence of indicative forms in the category of fiction,

but we ascribe this to the inadequacy of instances of fiction in our research rather than to a possible tendency to avoid the ‘mandative’ indicative in fiction writing.

Although our assumption about the genre category being a factor determining the form of the verb phrase in dependent imperative clauses proved wrong, we may see this as an indicator of the development of the mandative subjunctive in BrE. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the mandative subjunctive in BrE used to be generally restricted to texts of formal nature.³⁶ However, the results of the distribution with respect to genre category in our synchronic research – having used contemporary BrE as a source – showed no systematic preference of any category for a particular variant in dependent imperative clauses, which implies that the mandative subjunctive in present-day BrE is used rather evenly in various kinds of texts and is no longer tied to a specific environment.

Not surprisingly, the results showed the verb *suggest* complemented by a fairly large number of *should*-constructions, irrespective of the genre category.

³⁶ See: 2.5.1.

4. Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to explore the dependent imperative clause as the environment of paradigmatic variation of the mandative subjunctive, putative *should* and the indicative, and to examine the distribution of these variants in BrE. The subject matter was approached in two different ways: diachronically and synchronically.

Supporting previous research projects, the study proved that, from the diachronic point of view, the mandative constructions have redistributed in BrE since the second half of the 20th century. It was shown that the use of putative *should* decreased significantly between the 1960s and the 2000s, and a general increase in the mandative subjunctive through these years was detected. The resulting predominance of the mandative subjunctive over the other variants in dependent imperative clauses in present-day BrE may be assumed but cannot be absolutely confirmed, mainly due to the inevitable presence of the ambiguous non-distinct forms, which correspond to both the subjunctive and the indicative in form. Although these forms may in fact represent the mandative subjunctive, they cannot be unambiguously treated as subjunctives, because in BrE the indicative can be used in mandative environments as an alternative to the subjunctive and the *should*-construction. Furthermore, the ambiguous forms were found to have increased since the 1960s.

In the synchronic approach, the study focused on possible tendencies in using the individual variants in dependent imperative clauses in contemporary BrE. Several hypotheses were confirmed: firstly, the verb *suggest* as a governing suasive expression proved to differ from others, mainly in its clear preference for putative *should* in dependent imperative clauses following it. This characteristic feature of *suggest* was explained as a possible result of the attempt to disambiguate the dependent imperative clause from the dependent declarative one – which can also function as complementation of the verb *suggest* but with a different meaning – or the tendency to stress the semantics of the suasive *suggest* as well as the mandative meaning of the dependent clause.

Secondly, the structure of the subject of the dependent imperative clause proved to play a certain role in selecting the form of the verb phrase to be used in the predicate. When the subject is realized by a pronoun, there is a tendency to use the subjunctive or the indicative rather than putative *should*. On the other hand, when the subject is highly complex, that is, it is formed by a noun phrase containing postmodification, putative *should* is preferred over the other variants.

Finally, the study found the verb *be* as the predicate of the dependent imperative clause to be used more frequently with the mandative subjunctive than other verbs are, supporting previous assumptions. However, an argument was presented about the validity of the results: as the verb *be* is advantaged in that its subjunctive forms can be distinguished from the indicative in any environment, thus providing no ambiguous forms, it cannot be directly compared with other verbs, whose results of the frequencies of the mandative subjunctive will always be weakened by a certain number of ambiguous non-distinct forms.

Although the hypothesis about the specific semantics of the suasive verb (command versus suggestion) governing the choice between the subjunctive, putative *should* and the indicative in dependent imperative clauses was not sufficiently confirmed in our study, we can still regard it as a demonstrable tendency which should be further analyzed.

Regarding the influence of the form of the verb in the matrix clause and the type of genre category, no systematic tendencies were discovered.

References

- Baker, P. S. (2003) *Introduction to Old English*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Biber, D. et al. (2000) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Longman.
- Dušková, L. et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.
- Huddleston, R. and G. K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, Francis (1986) *Semantics of the English Subjunctive*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Mair, C. (2006) *Twentieth-Century English: History, Variation and Standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Övergaard, G. (1995) *The Mandative Subjunctive in American and British English in the 20th Century*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia, Vol. 94.
- Serpollet, N. (2001) 'The *mandative subjunctive* in British English seems to be alive and kicking... Is this due to the influence of American English?' in Rayson, P. et al. (eds) *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2001 Conference*. Lancaster University: UCREL Technical Papers, Vol. 13: 531 – 542.
- Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Vachek, J. (1991) *Standard English in Historical Perspective*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Vachek, J. and J. Firbas (1994) *Historický vývoj angličtiny*. Brno: Vydavatelství Masarykovy Univerzity.

Sources and tools

Leech, G. et al. (1961) Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus (LOB)

Mair, C. et al. (1991) Freiburg-LOB Corpus (FLOB)

Baker, P. (2006) British English 2006 Corpus (BE06), accessed through <http://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/be2006/index.php>

British National Corpus (BNC), accessed through <http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/cgi-bin/bncXML/BNCquery.pl?theQuery=search&urlTest=yes> in July 2010

Anthony, L.: AntConc, version 3.2.2.w (windows): freeware downloaded from <http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html> in October 2010

Summary (Shrnutí v češtině)

Bakalářská práce se zabývá anglickými závislými větami rozkazovacími, uvozenými výrazy (tj. slovesy, přídavnými nebo podstatnými jmény) vyjadřujícími žádost nebo návrh. V angličtině se v závislé větě rozkazovací nabízejí tři varianty realizace přísudku: tzv. „mandativní“ konjunktiv (jeden z typů přítomného konjunktivu), konstrukce se „should“ a indikativ, např.: *I demand that he go / should go / goes with us*. Konjunktiv bývá obecně označován jako specifikum americké angličtiny, protože se v britské angličtině, která má v závislých větách rozkazovacích preferovat variantu konstrukce se „should“ nebo indikativu, používá jen zřídka. Gramatiky a nejnovější studie zabývající se touto problematikou ale poukazují na to, že se konjunktiv v uvedené funkci začíná v současné britské angličtině stále více používat, pravděpodobně vlivem americké angličtiny. Indikativ jako jedna ze zmíněných variant v závislých větách rozkazovacích se má naopak vyskytovat výhradně v britské angličtině. Cílem bakalářské práce bylo prozkoumat vývoj distribuce konjunktivu, konstrukce se „should“ a indikativu v závislých větách rozkazovacích v britské angličtině od 60. let minulého století do současnosti a zároveň vysledovat možné tendence v užívání jednotlivých variant v daném dialektu.

Teoretická část práce čerpá jak z gramatik, tak z odpovídajících studií a poskytuje přehled zkoumané problematiky. Důležité je objasnění pojmu „věta rozkazovací“ jakožto podtypu závislé věty, protože různé gramatiky (zejména anglofonní) označují a dělí věty jinak. Práce se opírá o klasifikaci vedlejších vět podle Duškové a kol. a používá jejich termín „závislá věta rozkazovací“ pro označení vedlejší obsahové věty, která může být realizovaná buď infinitivem, nebo finitní vedlejší větou s přísudkem obsahujícím jednu ze tří výše uvedených variant, tedy konjunktiv, konstrukci se „should“ nebo indikativ. Tento pojem je pak doplněn o charakteristiku takové věty podle Quirka a kol., kteří uvádějí sémantické kritérium pro slovesa (resp. přídavná nebo podstatná jména) uvozující danou závislou větu. Teoretická část dále podrobněji popisuje jednotlivé varianty v přísudku tvaru závislé věty rozkazovací a jejich rozdělení v různých registrech a dialektech. Zabývá se také případy, ve kterých se rozdíl mezi konjunktivem a indikativem neutralizuje a není tak možné spolehlivě určit, o kterou z těchto variant jde, a upozorňuje na to, kdy může dojít k významovým nejasnostem.

Následující sekce se věnuje výzkumnému projektu, který představují dvě části: diachronní, převážně kvantitativní část, a synchronní, podrobná kvalitativní analýza. Zatímco diachronní část výzkumu se zaměřuje na vývoj distribuce variant v závislých

větech rozkazovacích v britské angličtině od druhé poloviny 20. století do současnosti, synchronní část se snaží definovat faktory, které by eventuálně mohly vést k preferenci té či oné varianty v závislé rozkazovací větě.

Diachronní výzkum vychází z gramatik a studií, které upozorňují na změny v distribuci variant v závislých větech rozkazovacích v britské angličtině v průběhu druhé poloviny 20. století (konkrétně na nárůst v užívání konjunktivu), a snaží se takovýto vývoj prozkoumat v rozmezí od 60. let minulého století do 1. desetiletí 21. století. Synchronní výzkum pracuje s hypotézami vytvořenými na základě poznatků z materiálu určeného primárně pro diachronní část. Za možné faktory ovlivňující výběr konjunktivu nebo konstrukce se „should“, případně indikativu byly označeny: užší sémantika výrazu v hlavní větě uvozující závislou rozkazovací větu, forma tohoto výrazu, struktura podmětu závislé věty, sloveso tvořící přísudek závislé věty a konečně typ textu, ve kterém se má celá věta nacházet. Dále bylo sloveso „suggest“, jako výraz návrhu ve větě řídící, označeno jako „zvláštní“, lišící se od ostatních velmi vysokou frekvencí konstrukcí se „should“ v rozkazovací větě jím uvozené.

Jako zdroj materiálu pro obě části výzkumu bylo vybráno několik korpusů britské angličtiny. Pro diachronní výzkum byly použity tři korpusy, odpovídající si jak velikostí, tak složením: Lancaster-Oslo Bergen Corpus (LOB) z 60. let minulého století, Freiburg-LOB Corpus (FLOB) z 90. let téhož století a nejnovější British English 2006 (BE06) z 1. desetiletí současného století. Pro synchronní výzkum nemohl být použit korpus BE06 kvůli své velikosti (1 milion slov), nedostatečné pro kvalitativní analýzu, a namísto něj byl vybrán Britský národní korpus (British National Corpus – BNC) s rozsahem 100 milionů slov.

V diachronní části projektu jsme zkoumali několik výrazů vyjadřujících žádost nebo návrh, přičemž konkrétní výrazy byly vybrány na základě jejich četnosti v BE06. V příslušných korpusech jsme hledali souvětí obsahující tyto výrazy v hlavní větě, jejichž předmět je tvořen závislou rozkazovací větou. Všechny vyhovující příklady z jednotlivých korpusů byly zaznamenány a rozděleny podle toho, jestli se v nich v závislé rozkazovací větě objevuje konjunktiv, konstrukce se „should“, indikativ nebo forma slovesa, u které nelze určit, zda jde o konjunktiv nebo indikativ. Následně byly porovnány frekvence jednotlivých variant v závislých větech rozkazovacích z různých korpusů, pro každý výraz zvlášť.

V synchronní části byla pro podrobnou kvalitativní analýzu vybrána celkem 4 slovesa: dvě vyjadřující žádost – „demand“ a „require“ – a dvě vyjadřující návrh –

„suggest“ a „recommend“. V Britském národním korpusu jsme vyhledali souvětí s těmito slovesy v hlavní větě, po které jako předmět následuje závislá věta rozkazovací, a to uvozená spojkou „that“. Ze všech nalezených příkladů byl pro analýzu excerpován jen určitý počet. Každý z nich byl pak popsán podle různých kritérií tak, aby mohly být vyjádřeny výsledky, které by potvrdily, nebo vyvrátily původní, výše zmíněné hypotézy.

Kapitola zabývající se výzkumným projektem dále přináší tabulky, které shrnují výsledky jak diachronní, tak synchronní části. Tabulky jsou rozdělené do několika sekcí, z nichž každá je doplněna o podrobnou diskusi. Bezprostředně následuje závěrečná část práce, která shrnuje poznatky z výzkumu, potvrzené i vyvrácené hypotézy.

Hlavním zjištěním diachronního výzkumu bylo to, že mezi 60. lety 20. století a začátkem 21. století v britské angličtině výrazně pokleslo užívání konstrukce se „should“ v poměru k jeho alternativám. Ačkoli by se z toho mohlo usuzovat, že užívání konjunktivu naopak značně vzrostlo a že je konjunktiv v současnosti dominantní variantou v závislých větách rozkazovacích, výsledky to přímo nepotvrzují: nejenže po některých výrazech frekvence konjunktivu vzrostla nepatrně nebo nevzrostla vůbec, ale výsledky poukazují na to, že v závislých rozkazovacích větách po výrazech, jako např. „suggest“ nebo „insist“, je i v současné britské angličtině převládající formou, i když v menší míře, než tomu bylo začátkem 2. poloviny minulého století, konstrukce se „should“. Nicméně je důležité si uvědomit, že výrazy „suggest“ a „insist“ jsou zvláštní tím, že mohou být doplněny jak závislou větou rozkazovací, tak oznamovací, ovšem se zásadní změnou významu. V případech, kdy se formální rozdíly mezi tvary konjunktivu a indikativu stírají, může po nich dojít k významovým nejasnostem a závislá rozkazovací věta se může chybně interpretovat jako oznamovací a naopak. Důsledkem toho může být fakt, že mluvčí mají tendenci právě po výrazech „suggest“ a „insist“ používat spíše „should“, aby explicitně vyjádřili rozkazovací význam nebo aby předešli nejasnostem. Větší frekvenci konstrukcí se „should“ po těchto výrazech snad způsobuje právě tato tendence. Je také třeba poukázat na to, že výsledná frekvence užití konjunktivu může být oslabena velkým počtem příkladů s konstrukcemi, u kterých nemůžeme určit, jestli jde o konjunktiv, nebo indikativ.

Synchronní výzkum potvrdil několik původních hypotéz. Za prvé, jedním z faktorů ovlivňujících výběr mezi konjunktivem, konstrukcí se „should“ a indikativem je struktura podmětu dané vedlejší věty. Po komplexních podmínkách, tj. skládajících se z podstatného jména a jednoho nebo více přívlastků (zejména pak, jde-li o postmodifikaci), následuje v přísudku většinou konstrukce se „should“. Konjunktiv nebo indikativ se naopak preferují v případech, kde podmětem je zájmeno.

Za druhé, sloveso „suggest“ se značně liší od ostatních výrazů uvozujících závislé rozkazovací věty v tom, že v těchto větách jasně preferuje konstrukci se „should“. Jak už bylo naznačeno, doplněním slovesa „suggest“ může být nejen závislá věta rozkazovací, ale i oznamovací. V případech, kdy rozkazovací věta jako doplnění „suggest“ obsahuje indikativ nebo slovesnou formu, kterou nelze identifikovat jako konjunktiv ani indikativ, nastává riziko, že se tato závislá věta interpretuje jako věta oznamovací, která používá jako formu přísudku typicky indikativ, ale která se zásadně liší významem, protože na rozdíl od závislé věty rozkazovací nevyjadřuje žádost ani doporučení, ale „oznamuje“ určitý fakt, a může tak dojít k chybné interpretaci celé výpovědi. Takovým nejasnostem a chybám ve výkladu se dá předejít tím, že se v rozkazovací závislé větě, která doplňuje sloveso „suggest“, užije konstrukce se „should“, čímž se jasně určí, že jde o větu rozkazovací, a nikoli větu oznamovací. Výsledky distribuce variant v závislých větách rozkazovacích po „suggest“ ukazují, že konstrukce se „should“ je neobvykle častá, mnohonásobně častější než stejná konstrukce v závislých rozkazovacích větách uvozených jinými výrazy, což může být právě důsledkem snahy mluvčích předcházet nejasnostem ve významu.

Poslední potvrzená hypotéza se týká vlivu slovesa v závislé větě rozkazovací na volbu mezi konjunktivem, konstrukcí se „should“ a indikativem. Podle výsledků výzkumu se sloveso „be“ vyskytuje v závislé rozkazovací větě ve formě konjunktivu častěji než ostatní slovesa v takové pozici. To může znamenat, že je zde určitá tendence používat konjunktiv zvlášť tehdy, je-li slovesem v přísudku závislé rozkazovací věty „be“. V diskusi se ale poukazuje na to, že sloveso „be“ má oproti ostatním slovesům jistou výhodu: jako jediné má totiž zvláštní formu holého infinitivu (totožnou s formou přítomného konjunktivu), která se vždy jasně liší od indikativu. Jiná slovesa tuto vlastnost nemají a v mnoha případech u nich v závislých větách rozkazovacích nelze určit, jestli jejich forma představuje konjunktiv, nebo indikativ. Výsledek frekvence konjunktivních konstrukcí je u těchto sloves oslaben počtem takovýchto „nejasných forem“, které sice mohou představovat konjunktiv, ale nelze to nijak dokázat, a tak nemohou být zařazeny mezi „opravdové“ konjunktivy. Celkový počet konjunktivů se tak logicky snížil. Otázkou je, zda výsledky nejsou zkresleny právě tímto zásadním rozdílem mezi slovesem „be“ a ostatními slovesy.

Předpoklad, že užší sémantika výrazu uvozujícího závislou rozkazovací větu určuje použití té či oné varianty, nebyl dostatečně potvrzen a musel by být proveden podrobnější výzkum, aby se taková tendence prokázala. Hypotézy týkající se formy slovesa v hlavní

věte a typu textu jako možných faktorů ovlivňujících volbu mezi konjunktivem, konstrukcí se „should“ a indikativem byly vyvráceny.

Appendices

Appendices are attached on a separate CD.